G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—20 12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1912

(Police)

File No. 3 of 02

Serial Nos. 34 and 38

~~Papers Filed.~~

Month _____

SUBJECT.

Prosecutions under Infant Marriage Prevention Regulation.

T. V. Ramaswamy Iyengar

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
Communicated	

SECTION – Pol –

Bundle 38 to 2

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,
(REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS)

(Full Office Note.)

‡ 1. No. and date of latest letter or paper.
2. Catch words to show nature of subject.
3. Subject to be in red and body of note in BLACK INK.

Subject. Infant marriage

Letter No 7217/433 dated 11th June 1903, from the Inspector-General of Police in Mysore, reporting the case of an infant marriage that took place at Arakishi, Nelamangala Taluk on the 22nd May 1902.

* **Note.**

The girl was 7 years, 4 months and 29 days on the date of marriage and so below the prescribed minimum. And the Inspector-General states that it is undesirable in his opinion that criminal prosecutions should be taken against the parties under the Infant Marriage Prevention Regn as the bride though a minor at the time of the marriage has now passed the age limit

Submitted for orders with reference to the 2nd para of the 2nd recommendation.

In a similar case the late Dewan considered that, the parties being Brahmans,

19/6/03

* 1. Statement of case in narrative form in regular sequence of subject matter or date.
2. Opinions to be stated only as supported by precedents, or general rules which should always be quoted.
3. Serial numbers in file, &c., to be always stated.
4. Dates of important documents referred should be given.
5. Write on both sides, leaving the same side as margin.

2

a prosecution could not be dispensed with on the mere ground of lapse of time. The same order has to be passed in this case, which is similar. Draft-sheet & also put up the previous file for

(Sd.) 25/6/03

Draft-sheet.

20/6/03

About delay – I think we had better issue a general order, as there is not a single case after recently in which the process is launched in time. (Please draft) given in this draft is somewhat opposed to our other orders & may be omitted.

Draft put up

Drafts submitted for

approval.

25/6/03

Mr. De

27/6/03

11108
27.6.03

1902—03

Dy. No. 13479
J. & E-2 From C. Madeah Esqr. R.B.
Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

Police.
30 Jan 03
34

To, H.V. Nanjundayya Esq. M.A.
Secretary to the Government
of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

SER' A

Dated. 11th Genl: and Rev: departments.
NO: 15
Sir, 7227/433 11th June 1903

I have the honor to submit one file a memo and other records connected with the infant marriage of Jeeve Boyee aged about 7 years 4 months and 29 days, daughter of Raghavendra char at Malishi Village Thirthahally Taluk and to requisition sanction of Government for the prosecution of the parties concerned in the said marriage

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant,

C. Madeah
Inspector General of Police

2

1. Name of the bride — Jeeva Boyee
2. of the bridegroom — Gopala Krishna char
3. of the bride's father — Raghavendra Char
4. of the bridegrooms father — Not living
5. of any other party concerned in the marriage — Hanumanthachar priest for the bridegroom and Vijaya char priest for bride and Jayachari.
6. Age of the bride on the day of marriage — 7 years 4 months and 29 days
7. Age of the bridegroom on the day of marriage — 14 years 7 months and 14 days
8. Date of marriage. — 22-5-1902.
9. Names of the village & Taluk where the marriage took place — Mahishi. Thirthahalli
10. Records connected with the Case — The entire records of the case together with the memo of the Police and Superin
11. Persons recommended for prosecution — Hanumanthachar and Vija priests for the bridegroom and respectively. Jayachar who helped groom in the place of his father and Raghave the father of the
12. Name of the officer recommending the prosecution under Section of the Infant Marriage prevention Regulation — Assistant Superintendent Shimoga district vide his docket dated 6.5.03.
13. Recommendation made by the Inspector General of Police — It appears to me undesirable criminal prosecutions should against the parties under Infant Regulation as the bride though at the time of the marriage has passed the age limit.
14. Any other remarks. — The cause of delay for 8 months has not been explained by the Superintendent explanation has called for

3 21

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

SECTION

No. 3469

READ 38-7227

Letter No. 7227 dated 11th June 1903

from the Inspector General of Police,

reporting that on the 22nd May 1902 an infant girl of 7 years, 4 months & 22 days

named Jeeva Boyee, ~~wife~~ daughter

of Raghavendrachar

was married to one Gopalakrishnachar

at Maheshi, Shettihalli Taluk

and stating that it appears to him undesirable that criminal prosecutions should be undertaken against the parties as the bride though a minor at the time of marriage, has now passed the age limit.

ORDER THEREON No. 20-21 DATED 3/7/03 189

J.F. 3603

Govt consider that a prosecution cannot be dispensed with in this case ~~on the ground of lapse of time~~ and accordingly direct

Under the provisions of section 3 of Regulation X of 1894, ~~the Government are pleased to direct~~ the prosecution, for offences under section 3 of the Mysore Infant Marriages Prevention Regulation, of ~~all~~ the marginally noted persons who caused the marriage of the infant girl named Jeeva Boyee with a boy named Gopalakrishnachar ~~and of all persons who~~ knowingly aided and abetted the same, ~~and of the said husband~~

2. There has been much delay in disposing this case finally. It must be explained.

20.6.03

General Secretary.

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District.
The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

returning enclos

order

29.VI.03

3. Gopalakrishnachar - who alleges his absence from home is the reason for this delay.
4. Kitty Gopalachar 3 priests.